No. 13.

INFORMATION FOR THE ELECTORS.

CF101

THE CHANGES WHICH TIME HAS BROUGHT.

Quotations are made from the speeches of Sir John Macdonald made many years ago to show the high appreciation that great statesman had of reciprocity, and it is attempted to prove that he has changed since. Circumstances have changed, not Sir John or the Government. In 1854, Canada was solely a producer of raw products, many of which find their only markets across the line. The English market was not so large or remunerative as it is to-day. The freightage across the ocean was long, uncertain, and expensive, and for six months in the year we had no outlet through a Canadian port. All this has been changed. Later still for fifteen years from 1860 to 1875, our neighbors were either engaged in the great national struggle or settling the western prairies. During these years they were still our natural market. Flour, pork and other products were shipped from Ontario westward to Chicago for a number of years. With the settlement of the western prairies a rapid change ensued. First there was a surplus of wheat and oats, then of pork, next of beef, grown on these prairies. Thus they retaliated on the Canadian farmer, and up to 1878 controlled the prices in Canada. The low prices of these products have since then driven western States' farmers and ranchmen into the production of poultry, barley and horses, and already the steadily lowering prices betokens what must follow. The acreage devoted to the production of grain, beef, and pork has, for twenty years, been double the rate of the increase in its population. It requires the cultivation of 3·15 acres in staple crops per head of the population to supply the people of the United States with food. In 1871 there were but 2·35 acres so cultivated, showing a difference of eight-tenths of an acre, the products of which had to be imported from abroad. In

F5013 .[1891?] C7E5 Ch

1888 there were under cultivation 3·36 acres of staples for every head of the population, so that to-day the farmers are growing fifteen millions acres of grain and other staples more than are consumed at home. For these they must find a market abroad. This flood of food from the western prairies poured on the eastern markets and brought ruin upon the farmers of New England, New York, and States along our border, and it would have had a similar effect upon the farmers of this country had it not been warded off by the protective policy of 1879. On the other hand, across the ocean there was a growing market. England, as it grew in wealth and population, had no new country to develop to supply its needs, and more and more had to depend upon food from abroad. The present Dominion Government, recognizing this, has, by improving our harbours, canals, railways and encouraging fast steamship lines, sought to cheapen and to quicken the way to this growing market. Very much used to be said about the egg trade by Commercial Unionists and they cannot complain if it be taken as an illustration of what has been said of the change in the two markets. As given in the Imperial Board of Agriculture returns of Great Britain and in the United States Trade and Navigation returns, the average prices of eggs per dozen in London and New York, in cents, were

	London.	New York.
1870	15	39·6
1875	20	25
1882	17	19
1883	16	20
1884	17	21
1885	17	21
1886	16	18
1887	16	16
1888	15·8	15·9
1889	16·1	13·9

The English market shows an advance of one cent, the United States an almost steady decrease until finally, in 1889, it was but little more than one-third the price of twenty years before. In the earlier years the United States imported from Europe, while for the last two years she has, at certain seasons, shipped eggs to Canada. The duty had nothing whatever to with it, as there has been complete free trade in eggs. As eggs have been laid down in Liverpool at one cent per dozen, or about the same price as in New York, the distance of the English market is now no barrier to trade.

These changes were strongly recognized by even the present advocates of commercial union before they began the advocacy of the foreign policy. Thus in his speech in Charlottetown in 1878, Sir Richard Cartwright said :—

" They say we must have reciprocity and that we cannot live without it as a Dominion. I take exception to that statement. While reciprocity is desirable, we are not in such a state of subjection to the United States that we cannot live without it. We have men and ships and will carry the war into Africa. We will find new markets for ourselves and will cut them out."

In the same year, Mr. John Charlton could rejoice that there was an opening for our barley in England, and said :—

" It had been asserted by gentlemen on the opposite side of the House that the American duty upon Canadian barley diminished the price by the Canadian farmer to the exact amount of the American duty. He should not enter to-night into the discussion of this question, though it was his belief that the American duty was actually paid, in a great measure at least, by the American consumer, and made very little difference indeed with the price received by the Canadian farmer. Fortunately for Canada, the United States would no longer be our only market for barley. A large trade had within the past year sprung up with Great Britain. Our barley had been received with great favor there, and Great Britain could easily absorb our entire surplus. That being the case, English and American buyers would hereafter become competitors for the purchase of our barley. Its price would be fixed as the price of our other cereals now most unquestionably in the open markets of the world, and then it would be a matter of the utmost indifference to our farmers whether the American Government did or did not impose a duty upon barley."

Unfortunately the Reform Government of that day did not follow up its brave words and encourage that trade. The bright prospect died out for lack of proper facilities and knowledge of the qualities required for the English market. If the word of Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Charlton were true then, they are still more applicable to-day owing to the changed markets of the United States. The Government recognizes that there is a limited number of articles which, owing to climatic differences, can be better produced in one country than in the other, and believe that an interchange of these products upon fair terms would be alike beneficial to both countries, and have been ready to discuss better trade relations ever since the abrogation of the treaty of 1854.

The United States Governments have since 1874 refused

30283 16

to meet our Government, and they have been aided in this in latter years by the

INSANE POLICY OF COMMERCIAL UNIONISTS.

Let it be remembered that the old treaty was abrogated mainly on the information contained in a report sent to Congress by the Hon. Israel Hatch, of Buffalo, who gave a most dismal account of the state of affairs in Canada at that time, and told the United States Congress that by refusing a renewal of that treaty it could make Canada come to its terms and accept conditions that would inevitably lead to annexation. It is a matter of history that Mr. Hatch derived his alleged facts and figures from the dismal writings to the Reform press of that day—and largely from an address issued to the people of Upper Canada by the Reform convention of 1859. The latter document was sent to Congress with his report, and was bound up with it and a number of other documents on the trade relations with Canada. and so exists to-day. The Reform leaders of that day were thoroughly loyal men; they did not intend to aid in influencing the Congress of the United States to abrogate the treaty, but their mistaken notion of the position and future of this country had that effect.

In 1871 Sir John A. Macdonald was offered reciprocity treaty in certain products by the United States Government. While the matter was under consideration our own parliament was in session. The Reform opposition, aided by a number of Conservatives, repealed the duty which had been imposed by Canada on the importation of these articles from the United States, and upon the fact becoming known the United States authorities withdrew their offer, and a duty has been levied upon those Canadian products from that hour to this.

In endeavoring to make a bargain no sane man would dwell upon his poverty and declare that he must make that bargain at any price or go into bankruptcy. Yet this is precisely what the commercial unionists have been doing for the last four years. The madness of such a course was acknowledged by the men who are now pursuing it.

In his speech in Charlottetown, Sir Richard Cartwright said:

"There is nothing better calculated to prevent the bringing about of reciprocity than to tell the Americans we cannot live without them. It would induce them to believe that they had the power to drive us to their own terms."

What the terms were is intimated in an after-speech by Sir Richard Cartwright, when he said:—

"Is it a wise policy on the part of Sir John and his organ to

show to the Americans such great anxiety to secure free trade with them? Is that not the way to prevent a reciprocity treaty? Is not the American answer under such circumstances certain to be that of the New York *Sun*,—'Reciprocity with Canada, why, yes, certainly we are ready for it, only it would be convenient for the several provinces of the Dominion to be admitted to the United States as a constitutional precedent.'"

The *Globe*, in commenting on that speech, said:—

"The true attitude in reference to the United States is that which the Reform party has always taken. 'We can live without your trade, we are flourishing under our present tariff arrangements. We are not willing to annex ourselves and are not anxious for any change, but we are willing to make a fair reciprocity treaty that will benefit both countries.'"

That paper afterwards commended the policy of Sir John Macdonald, for in its issue of the 28th March, 1878, it said:—

"When the United States Government expresses any desire for the renewal of the treaty, Canada will be prepared to send a delegation to Washington to act in concert with the British Ambassador at Washington on the subject, but not before. In the meanwhile there is, says Sir John, no use saying anything on the subject. This is the only course open to Canadian Ministers compatible with the maintenance of anything like respect either for their country or themselves."

If Messrs. Laurier and Cartwright had designedly set about it to prevent the United States from considering fair reciprocal arrangements and to induce that people not to reply to any proposition our Government might make—in the language of the New York *Sun*, they could not possibly pursue a course better calculated to accomplish it than they are now doing, themselves being the judges.

ALREADY REJECTED.

The policy of Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Wiman has been tendered to all the other nations of this hemisphere by the United States and by them rejected. During the early months of last year a body, known as the Pan-American congress sat at Washington. It was an assembly, upon invitation of the United States Government, of delegates of all the nations of America to consider the subject of reciprocity. From that gathering Canada was ostentatiously excluded. The reason given by organs of President Harrison's administration for this exclusion, was that they expected Canada to become a part of the United States, while there was no such expectation that Brazil or Chili or the Argentine Republic ever would. These delegates were wined and dined, flattered and petted, and when the proper time was supposed to have arrived, closer trade relations were proposed and

commercial union was first suggested as the means; when the South American delegates refused to entertain this, then unrestricted reciprocity was tendered. This was not more favorably considered, and the committee to whom it was referred, reported, the United States delegates agreeing as well as others:—

"But this step would in the opinion of the committee, require a partial sacrifice of the national sovereignty of the American nations and more radical changes in their constitutions than, in the judgment of the committee, they are willing to accept.

"The committee believes that such a union is at present impracticable as a continental system."

In this country, as well as in the United States, it is the fashion of some to sneer at the greasers of Mexico and the half-breeds of South America, but they were sufficiently intelligent to reject unanimously a policy which Sir Richard Cartwright wishes this country to beg for. They rejected it though they had no manufactories to lose, and though they produced the sugar, coffee and other products for which the United States was a natural market. They unanimously rejected it because they had no desire to have their tariff and laws subjected to the United States; because they did not wish their trade restricted to a single nation; because they wished to be able to buy wherever they could purchase to the best advantage.

CAN IT BE GOT?

It is urged by Commercial Unionists that the United States Government will not make such a treaty as the Dominion Government is willing to offer. This no man can say. Circumstances change and Governments must change to meet them. The *personnel* and policies of Governments likewise change. In a few days the control of one branch of the United States Legislature will pass from the party now in power and what may henceforward be the policy no one dare say. One thing is certain that there is not the slightest evidence that the Government or people of the United States are willing at this moment to negotiate any treaty with Canada that does not tend immediately to sever our relations with the Mother Country and to promote annexation with the United States. When the agitation was begun it was alleged that the Republican party, through Butterworth, Hitt, and Senator Sherman, were willing to enter into commercial relations with this country, but session after session of Congress passed and the promises of Mr. Wiman remained unfilled, and the last hope, Senator Sherman, did not even venture to submit his resolution to the Senate. During the recent elections better trade-

relations with Canada were scarcely ever referred to, and when they were it was to condemn the proposal. "Canadians cannot be Canadians and Americans too. If Canadians want to get the advantage of the American market it is by becoming American citizens," said Mr. Blaine. "Canada is blubbering for a reciprocity treaty. Let her blubber until she is willing to join the Union," said General Butler, and since the elections the utterances have been inspired by like sentiments. Even those who have favored commercial union have advocated it because it will lead to annexation. "I am in favor of commercial union because it will bring Canada under our flag," said a leader of the Democrats, Senator Carlisle. "I am in favor of it," said Mr. Depew, "because it will advance the Stars and Stripes from Niagara Falls to the North Pole." The utterances of Mr. Wiman upon this point are so numerous and so well known as to scarcely need quotation. His contention is, as it always has been, that the United States cannot coerce Canada into annexation, but by a commercial union she can be brought into the Union. He shows that commercial union, or as he sometimes names it "Unrestricted Reciprocity" is equivalent to abandonment of Britain. In his last utterance, in the article in the *North American Review* of January last, there is this sentence:—

"If, as the first step towards independence, the Canadian people were asked to vote upon the proposition to procure for them political freedom, no one act could be proposed which would be more significant in that direction than the one which the Liberal party now practically ask the Canadian people to acquiesce in."

On every side the same story is met. No later than Friday, 30th January, Sir Richard Cartwright delivered a speech in advocacy of his policy at the dinner of the Boston Chamber of Commerce. He was immediately followed by General Bullock, of Atlanta, who said that the proper way to secure it was by Sir Richard becoming

"THE SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF ONTARIO."

Even Senator Sherman's resolution, of which so much has been promised by Sir Richard Cartwright and his followers, looked to a political as well as a commercial arrangement. The most extraordinary thing in the contention is that up to the last moment we were assured that better trade relations were to be obtained through the Republican party, but to-day we are commanded to rejoice because the Republican party had been defeated, because the Democratic party had all along been the genuine friends of

Canada The Republican party has negotiated reciprocity treaties ; the Democratic party not only has not negotiated such a treaty with any nation in forty years, but it has opposed every treaty that has been proposed. The leaders of that party are opposed to any treaty that will take the absolute control of the tariff out of the hands of Congress. What may come out of the negotiations now pending upon various branches of our relations with that country, it is impossible to say. If we are to have a fair treaty with our neighbours, it is of the highest importance that they should be undeceived of their present conception of the condition of this country. When they are definitely given to understand that, while desirous of better trade relations, this country will neither sacrifice its self-respect, its connection with the Mother Country, nor the freest control over its own affairs, then we may expect to treat with them frankly and fairly. This can be unmistakeably done only by the electorate driving from public life the men whose hunger for office has led them deliberately to pursue a course that has misrepresented us and deceived our neighbours.

Our neighbours are eminently a bargain-making people. When satisfied they cannot get everything they wish they will be willing to accept something that will be fair to both and mutually profitable. That must be sooner or later, and probably sooner than later. When that time comes it is of the utmost importance that the control of our affairs shall be in the hands of men of undoubted ability and of undoubted loyalty—men who are not only Canadians by accident of residence but by faith in the future of this great country. Can this be said of Messrs. Laurier and Cartwright ? Let it not be forgotten that their policy is a United States policy. It was not originated by them nor in Canada. It is in direct opposition, as has been shown, to their former policy and utterances. They have posed as the advocates of free trade and opposed our moderate protection as disloyal to the mother country. They now advocate the adoption of the most ultra protection and of a policy that must lead to separation from Great Britain. It is a foreign policy and is dependent for success upon foreign favor. The secret missions to Washington; the running to and fro between their foreign principals and their Canadian echoes ; all betoken that the country dare not trust its interests in such hands. Nor is there the slightest evidence that the heroes of the blunders and blindness of 1878 are one whit better informed now as to the needs of the country.